

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In complete response to the Office Action dated September 24, 2007, on the above identified application, reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 19-36 are pending in this application.

With this amendment, claims 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, 30, 35, and 36 are amended, claims 22 and 23 are cancelled, and claims 37-41 are added to further define the invention. The Specification is also amended.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claim 30 is rejected under 35, U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended claim 30 to be dependent upon claim 19. For this reason, the Applicants respectfully contend that the basis for this rejection deserves reconsideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 19, 21-22, and 24-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Buchanan, et al. (US 6,984,591). For at least the following reasons, the Applicants respectfully contend that the claims of the instant application are not anticipated by Buchanan '591.

The precursor source mixture of Buchanan '591 is dissolved, emulsified or suspended in an inert liquid selected from the group consisting of aliphatic hydrocarbons, alcohols, ethers, etc. Buchanan's method of forming the film comprises vaporizing a precursor present in the precursor source mixture, and depositing a constituent of the vaporized precursor on a substrate to form a film.

Meanwhile, the instant invention teaches forming a dielectric or metallic film by depositing previously vaporized silicon at the feed conditions that result in the film forming at the desired composition in a single step. The method of the instant invention also avoids the control and quality problems associated with vaporizing

precursors or bubbling a carrier gas through a liquid to feed the silicon source by using previously only silicon vaporized prior to introducing the vaporous silicon to the deposition chamber. The film deposited by the instant application is either a MSiO or a MSiN type film.

While Buchanan '591 may disclose a deposition process for a metal oxide film, **on a silicon layer**, it does not teach, disclose or suggest a deposition of a MSiO or MSiN film (i.e. a layer **containing** silicon), as per the instant invention.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 20 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchanan et al. (US 6,984,591). Due to at least the aforementioned claim amendments, and the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully contend that the basis for this rejection should be moot.

Appl. No. 10/591,629
Attorney Docket No. Serie 6550 CIP
Amdt. dated January 24, 2008
Response to Office Action of September 24, 2007

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application now stands in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. Clark', is written over a horizontal line.

Brandon S. Clark
Registration No. 59,020

Date: **January 24, 2008**

Air Liquide
2700 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1800
Houston, Texas 77056
Phone: (713) 624-8787
Fax: (713) 624-8950